

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/602,127

Applicant(s)

LOOMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1732

All Participants:(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.(2) David H. Brinkman (Reg. No. 40,532)**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1 September 2004**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

that of record.

Claims discussed:

independent claims 5, 10, 17, 22 and those dependent thereon.

Prior art documents discussed:

*that of record.***Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Clarification of the phrase "substantial length" of the flow restrictor was discussed. It was concluded that the phrase is equivalent to or interpreted as "substantially the entire length" as distinguished from 'a partial length' which was discussed in applicant's remarks filed 20-AUG-2004..